

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

23
24
25
26
27
28

1 oppose the Motion to Amend. In Defendant's Notice of Motion to
2 Consolidate, Defendant also states that Plaintiff had previously
3 agreed to stipulate to consolidation.

4 Central District of California Local Rule 7-9 requires an
5 opposing party to file an opposition to any motion at least
6 twenty-one (21) days prior to the date designated for hearing the
7 motion. Additionally, Local Rule 7-12 provides that "[t]he
8 failure to file any required document, or the failure to file it
9 within the deadline, may be deemed consent to the granting or
10 denial of the motion." The hearings on Defendant's Motions were
11 set for May 21, 2012. Any opposition was therefore due by April
12 30, 2012.

13 Accordingly, pursuant to Local Rule 7-12 and in light of
14 Defendant's representations that Plaintiff does not oppose either
15 Motion, the court deems Plaintiff's failure to oppose as consent
16 to granting the Motions. The court therefore GRANTS Defendant's
17 Motion to Amend. The Court notes the three cases already have the
18 same trial dates and vacates the Motion to Consolidate as moot.

19
20 IT IS SO ORDERED.

21
22
23 Dated: June 18, 2012


DEAN D. PREGERSON
United States District Judge